UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,900	07/11/2000	IAN E. SMITH	D/A0463-US-NP	9960

7590 05/10/2006

Patent Documentation Center
Xerox Corporation
Xerox Sq., 20th Floor
100 Clinton Ave. S.
Rochester, NY 14644

EXAMINER
LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/613,900	SMITH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christian La Forgia	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 February 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8,9,11-13,15-20,22,23,25-27,29-34,36,37,39-41 and 43-51* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8,9,11-13,15-20,22,23,25-27,29-34,36,37,39-41,43-45 and 49-51* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *46-48* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The amendment of 28 February 2006 has been noted and made of record.

2.   Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-20, 22, 23, 25-27, 29-34, 36, 37, 39-41, and 43-51 have been

presented for examination.

3.   Claims 46-48 are objected to as being allowable subject matter depending from a rejected

claim.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed 28 February 2006 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

5.   In response to the Applicant's arguments that the cited reference fails to teach comparing

the address format of the destination address to acceptable address formats defined by the

applications, the Examiner disagrees. As seen in the cited sections of column 3 of the Zurcher

reference, Zurcher discloses making a determination as to which application should be run, based

on the attributes of the message. One of the attributes to consider is the format of the message,

and which application to invoke.

6.   Therefore, Zurcher discloses comparing the address format of the destination address to

acceptable address formats defined by the applications.

7. . .   See further rejections that follow.

Claim Rejections

8.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

9.   Claims 1-3, 8, 11, 15-17, 22, 25, 29-31, 36, 39, and 43-45 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,425,002 to Zurcher et al., hereinafter

Zurcher.

10.   As per claims 1, 15, and 29, Zurcher teaches a computerized method of operating an e-

mail-invoked application server comprising the steps of:

receiving an incoming e-mail message from a sender utilizing a network, wherein the

incoming e-mail includes content and a destination address having an address format (column 2,

lines 35-43; column 2, line 66 to 3, line 3, column 3, lines 41-42, column 5, lines 52-65 i.e.

inbound messages, e-mail messages, SMS messages, internet messages);

determining which application of a plurality of applications available on the e-mail

invoked application server will accept the incoming e-mail for processing by comparing the

address format of the destination address to acceptable address formats defined by the

applications (column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 29, i.e. "determining whether the inbound

message is to be delivered to one application or the other application or both applications," "rules

are applied to attributes of each new message, determine program from attributes");

refusing the incoming e-mail when it is determined that no application will accept the

incoming e-mail for processing (column 3, lines 48-52, column 4, lines 11-16, column 6, lines 9-

33, i.e. declaring a message not handled); and

invoking at least one of a plurality of applications to process the content of the incoming

e-mail when it is determined that the attributes are acceptable as defined by the at least one -

application (column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 29, column 5, lines 17-40). Zurcher discloses

making a determination based on message attributes, which include the address format as

indicated by column 3, lines 35-38, specifically under the definition of Message as including

addressing information necessary to deliver the data and optionally additional attributes.

11.   Regarding claims 2, 16, and 30, Zurcher teaches storing at least a portion of the incoming

e-mail message in a database (column 3, lines 12-15, column 7, lines 22-30).

12.   Regarding claims 3, 17, and 31, Zurcher teaches wherein the at least one application is

selected from the group consisting of a lead tracking application, a job requisitioning application,

an event planning application, a task list management application, a project management

application, and an accountability application (column 2, lines 35-43). Microsoft Outlook and

Lotus Notes both provide functions for event planning, a task list, project management and

accountability.

13.   Regarding claims 8, 22, and 36, Zurcher teaches wherein the at least one application

invoked by the incoming email generates an event to advance the processing of a task (column 7,

lines 2-23).

14.   Regarding claims 11, 25, and 39, Zurcher teaches wherein the e-mail message includes an

attachment (column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 29, column 5, lines 17-40). Zurcher discloses

making a determination based on message attributes, which include the attachments as indicated

by column 3, lines 35-38.

15.   Concerning claims 43, 44, and 45, Zurcher teaches wherein the step of invoking at least

one application is responsive to the attachment (column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 29, column

5, lines 17-40). Zurcher discloses making a determination based on message attributes, which

include the attachments as indicated by column 3, lines 35-38.

16.   Claims 4-6, 9, 18-20, 23, 32-34, 37, and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Zurcher in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,689 to Raghunandan,

hereinafter Raghunandan.

17.   Regarding claims 4, 18, and 32, Zurcher does not disclose wherein the at least one

application invoked by the incoming email generates a reply to the incoming e-mail to advance

the processing of a task.

18.   Raghunandan teaches wherein the at least one application invoked by the incoming email

generates a reply to the incoming e-mail to advance the processing of a task (column 1, lines 57-

67).

19.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to generate a reply to the incoming e-mail to advance the processing of a task, since

Raghunandan discloses at column 1, lines 62-67 that such a modification provides for a vigorous

discussion between the original sender and all of the recipients.

20.   Regarding claims 5, 19, and 33, Zurcher does not disclose wherein the at least one

application summarizes an interaction between one or more users of the e-mail invoked

application server.

21.   Raghunandan teaches wherein the at least one application summarizes an interaction between one or more users of the e-mail invoked application server (column 2, lines 48-58).

22.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to summarize an interaction between users, since Raghunandan discloses at column 2, lines 9-18 that such a technique would supplement e-mail tools with powerful facilities so as to enable optimal utilization of internet bandwidth.

23.   With regards to claims 6, 20, and 34, Zurcher does not disclose wherein a task list is generated to summarize the interaction.

24.   Raghunandan teaches wherein a task list is generated to summarize the interaction (column 2, lines 48-58).

25.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate a task list, since Raghunandan discloses at column 2, lines 9-18 that such a technique would supplement e-mail tools with powerful facilities so as to enable optimal utilization of internet bandwidth.

26.   With regards to claims 9, 23, and 37, Zurcher does not disclose wherein a reply to the e-mail message is utilized to generate another e-mail message to obtain information for the database.

27.   Raghunandan teaches wherein a reply to the e-mail message is utilized to generate another e-mail message to obtain information for the database (column 1, lines 57-67).

28.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to generate another e-mail message to obtain information for the database, since

Raghunandan discloses at column 1, lines 62-67 that such a modification provides for a vigorous

discussion between the original sender and all of the recipients.

29.   Regarding claims 49-51, Zurcher does not disclose determining a recipient email address

of an actual recipient of the incoming e-mail; and transmitting the incoming e-mail message to

the recipient email address utilizing the network.

30.   Raghunandan teaches determining a recipient email address of an actual recipient of the

incoming e-mail; and transmitting the incoming e-mail message to the recipient email address

utilizing the network (column 2, lines 1-9).

31.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to include e-mail aliasing, since Raghunandan states at column 2, lines 1-9 that such a

modification would facilitate identification and reduce the burden of repeatedly entering

individual e-mail addresses.

32.   Claims 12, 13, 26, 27, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Zurcher in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,546 to Biliris et al., hereinafter

Biliris.

33.   Regarding claims 12, 26, and 40, Zurcher does not disclose generating an index based on

the one or more attributes of the incoming e-mail message; and storing the index in a database.

34.   Biliris teaches generating an index based on the one or more attributes of the incoming e-mail message; and storing the index in a database (column 6, lines 41-62).

35.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate an index based on the one or more attributes of the incoming e-mail message and store the index in a database, since Biliris discloses at column 1, lines 27-35 that such a modification would all a messaging system to easily define and modify message attributes.

36.   Regarding claims 13, 27, and 41, Zurcher does not disclose storing the incoming e-mail messages in a database; categorizing the content of the incoming e-mail messages into one or more categories, and permitting retrieval of the information from the database according to at least one of the one or more categories

37.   Biliris teaches storing the incoming e-mail messages in a database; categorizing the content of the incoming e-mail messages into one or more categories, and permitting retrieval of the information from the database according to at least one of the one or more categories (column 6, lines 7-29).

38.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the incoming e-mail messages in a database; categorize the content of the incoming e-mail messages into one or more categories, and permit retrieval of the information from the database according to at least one of the one or more categories, since Biliris discloses at column 1, lines 27-35 that such a modification would all a messaging system to easily define and modify message attributes.

Allowable Subject Matter

39.   Claims 46-48 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would

be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim

and any intervening claims.

40.   The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The Examiner could not find any teachings or motivation for the limitation that wherein one3 of

the acceptable address formats defined by the plurality of applications is data@host.domain,

wherein domain indicates a domain name of the email-invoked application server, host indicates

an application available at the domain, and data indicates information provided by the sender

(Emphasis added).

Conclusion

41.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

42.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

43.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Christian La Forgia whose telephone number is (571) 272-3792.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7-5.

44.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

45.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christian LaForgia
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2131

clf

**CHRISTOPHER REVAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Cel 5/9/06